

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2828/ 306400.01
Application No.: 10/805,706
Office Action Dated: March 27, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Fig. 1. The sheets, which include Figs. 1-5, replace the original sheets, including Figs. 1-5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-18 will remain pending in this application. Claims 6 and 15 were previously canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the above amendments.

The Drawings are objected to because they allegedly include reference characters not mentioned in the Description. Claims 3, 7, 11-13 and 16 are objected to due to alleged informalities. Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. Claims 1-4, 10-13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0107843 (“Biebesheimer”) in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0107843 (“Davallou”). Claims 5, 7-9, 14, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,571,236 (“Ruppelt”) in view of United States Patent No. 6,434,547 (“Mishelevich”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Brent Stace participated in a telephonic interview on April 25, 2007, during which the above claim amendments were discussed. Agreement was reached, and Examiner Stace agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the above claim amendments.

Drawings

The Drawings are objected to because they allegedly include reference characters not mentioned in the Description. The Drawings are hereby amended to delete these reference numbers.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 7, 11-13 and 16 are objected to due to alleged informalities. Applicants have made the necessary corrections to claims 3, 7, 11-13 and 16.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that there is no useful tangible result. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that independent claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 14 and 18 provide useful tangible results such as, for example correcting a problem to improve performance of a search mechanism. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the category of invention to which claims 4 and 9 are directed is unclear. Claims 4 and 9 are hereby amended to recite a computer readable storage medium. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 1-4, 10-13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0107843 (“Biebesheimer”) in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0107843 (“Davallou”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 10, 11 and 18 recite prompting the user for information regarding an extent to which a search result corresponds to a search request.

The Office Action states that Biebesheimer fails to suggest context-based user feedback data. Rather, the Office Action cites Davallou as allegedly teaching context-based user feedback data. In particular, Davallou (¶ 33) discloses that a user can enter an initial request (*i.e.*, query) that produces no results. The user can then enter a subsequent request that produces some results. The user can then be asked whether or not the subsequent query is what the user actually intended. Thus, Davallou discloses asking a user to evaluate the relationship between his intent and his request. Davallou does not teach or suggest asking the user evaluate the relationship between his request and the results of his request.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or

suggest "prompting the user for information regarding an extent to which a search result corresponds to a search request," as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 11 and 18.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10, 11 and 18 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit claims 2-4, 12 and 13 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

2. Claims 5, 7-9, 14, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,571,236 ("Ruppelt") in view of United States Patent No. 6,434,547 ("Mishelevich"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ruppelt and Mishelevich also fail to teach or suggest asking the user evaluate the relationship between his request and the results of his request. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest "context-based user feedback data comprising information regarding an extent to which a search result corresponds to a search request," as recited in independent claims 5 and 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 5 and 14 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit claims 7-9, 16 and 17 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2828/ 306400.01
Application No.: 10/805,706
Office Action Dated: March 27, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Date: May 29, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439